ECS 235B Module 11
Expressiveness
Expressive Power

• How do the sets of systems that models can describe compare?
  • If HRU equivalent to SPM, SPM provides more specific answer to safety question
  • If HRU describes more systems, SPM applies only to the systems it can describe
HRU vs. SPM

• SPM more abstract
  • Analyses focus on limits of model, not details of representation
• HRU allows revocation
  • SMP has no equivalent to delete, destroy
• HRU allows multiparent creates
  • SMP cannot express multiparent creates easily, and not at all if the parents are of different types because can\textbullet create allows for only one type of creator
Multiparent Create

• Solves mutual suspicion problem
  • Create proxy jointly, each gives it needed rights

• In HRU:

```
  command multicreate(s₀, s₁, o)
  if r in a[s₀, s₁] and r in a[s₁, s₀]
  then
    create object o;
    enter r into a[s₀, o];
    enter r into a[s₁, o];
  end
```
SPM and Multiparent Create

• $cc$ extended in obvious way
  • $cc \subseteq TS \times \ldots \times TS \times T$

• Symbols
  • $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ parents, $Y$ created
  • $R_{1,i}, R_{2,i}, R_{3, i}, R_{4, i} \subseteq R$

• Rules
  • $cr_{P,i}(\tau(X_1), \ldots, \tau(X_n)) = Y/R_{1,1} \cup X_i/R_{2,i}$
  • $cr_{C}(\tau(X_1), \ldots, \tau(X_n)) = Y/R_3 \cup X_1/R_{4,1} \cup \ldots \cup X_n/R_{4,n}$
Example

• Anna, Bill must do something cooperatively
  • But they don’t trust each other

• Jointly create a proxy
  • Each gives proxy only necessary rights

• In ESPM:
  • Anna, Bill type $a$; proxy type $p$; right $x \in R$
  • $cc(a, a) = p$
  • $cr_{Anna}(a, a, p) = cr_{Bill}(a, a, p) = \emptyset$
  • $cr_{proxy}(a, a, p) = \{ Anna/x, Bill/x \}$
2-Parent Joint Create Suffices

• Goal: emulate 3-parent joint create with 2-parent joint create

• Definition of 3-parent joint create (subjects \( P_1, P_2, P_3 \); child \( C \)):
  • \( cc(\tau(P_1), \tau(P_2), \tau(P_3)) = Z \subseteq T \)
  • \( cr_{p_1}(\tau(P_1), \tau(P_2), \tau(P_3)) = C/R_{1,1} \cup P_1/R_{2,1} \)
  • \( cr_{p_2}(\tau(P_1), \tau(P_2), \tau(P_3)) = C/R_{2,1} \cup P_2/R_{2,2} \)
  • \( cr_{p_3}(\tau(P_1), \tau(P_2), \tau(P_3)) = C/R_{3,1} \cup P_3/R_{2,3} \)
General Approach

- Define agents for parents and child
  - Agents act as surrogates for parents
  - If create fails, parents have no extra rights
  - If create succeeds, parents, child have exactly same rights as in 3-parent creates
    - Only extra rights are to agents (which are never used again, and so these rights are irrelevant)
Entities and Types

- Parents $P_1, P_2, P_3$ have types $p_1, p_2, p_3$
- Child $C$ of type $c$
- Parent agents $A_1, A_2, A_3$ of types $a_1, a_2, a_3$
- Child agent $S$ of type $s$
- Type $t$ is parentage
  - if $X/t \in \text{dom}(Y)$, $X$ is $Y$'s parent
- Types $t, a_1, a_2, a_3, s$ are new types
can\•create

• Following added to can\•create:
  • \(cc(p_1) = a_1\)
  • \(cc(p_2, a_1) = a_2\)
  • \(cc(p_3, a_2) = a_3\)
    • Parents creating their agents; note agents have maximum of 2 parents
  • \(cc(a_3) = s\)
    • Agent of all parents creates agent of child
  • \(cc(s) = c\)
    • Agent of child creates child
Creation Rules

• Following added to create rule:
  • \( cr_p(p_1, a_1) = \emptyset \)
  • \( cr_C(p_1, a_1) = p_1/Rtc \)
    • Agent’s parent set to creating parent; agent has all rights over parent
  • \( cr_{P\text{first}}(p_2, a_1, a_2) = \emptyset \)
  • \( cr_{P\text{second}}(p_2, a_1, a_2) = \emptyset \)
  • \( cr_C(p_2, a_1, a_2) = p_2/Rtc \cup a_1/tc \)
    • Agent’s parent set to creating parent and agent; agent has all rights over parent (but not over agent)
Creation Rules

- $cr_{P_{first}}(p_3, a_2, a_3) = \emptyset$
- $cr_{P_{second}}(p_3, a_2, a_3) = \emptyset$
- $cr_C(p_3, a_2, a_3) = p_3/Rtc \cup a_2/tc$
  - Agent’s parent set to creating parent and agent; agent has all rights over parent (but not over agent)
- $cr_p(a_3, s) = \emptyset$
- $cr_c(a_3, s) = a_3/tc$
  - Child’s agent has third agent as parent $cr_p(a_3, s) = \emptyset$
- $cr_p(s, c) = C/Rtc$
- $cr_c(s, c) = c/R_3tc$
  - Child’s agent gets full rights over child; child gets $R_3$ rights over agent
Link Predicates

- Idea: no tickets to parents until child created
  - Done by requiring each agent to have its own parent rights
    - $link_1(A_2, A_1) = A_1/t \in \text{dom}(A_2) \land A_2/t \in \text{dom}(A_2)$
    - $link_1(A_3, A_2) = A_2/t \in \text{dom}(A_3) \land A_3/t \in \text{dom}(A_3)$
    - $link_2(S, A_3) = A_3/t \in \text{dom}(S) \land C/t \in \text{dom}(C)$
    - $link_3(A_1, C) = C/t \in \text{dom}(A_1)$
    - $link_3(A_2, C) = C/t \in \text{dom}(A_2)$
    - $link_3(A_3, C) = C/t \in \text{dom}(A_3)$
    - $link_4(A_1, P_1) = P_1/t \in \text{dom}(A_1) \land A_1/t \in \text{dom}(A_1)$
    - $link_4(A_2, P_2) = P_2/t \in \text{dom}(A_2) \land A_2/t \in \text{dom}(A_2)$
    - $link_4(A_3, P_3) = P_3/t \in \text{dom}(A_3) \land A_3/t \in \text{dom}(A_3)$
Filter Functions

• $f_1(a_2, a_1) = a_1/t \cup c/Rtc$
• $f_1(a_3, a_2) = a_2/t \cup c/Rtc$
• $f_2(s, a_3) = a_3/t \cup c/Rtc$
• $f_3(a_1, c) = p_1/R_{4,1}$
• $f_3(a_2, c) = p_2/R_{4,2}$
• $f_3(a_3, c) = p_3/R_{4,3}$
• $f_4(a_1, p_1) = c/R_{1,1} \cup p_1/R_{2,1}$
• $f_4(a_2, p_2) = c/R_{1,2} \cup p_2/R_{2,2}$
• $f_4(a_3, p_3) = c/R_{1,3} \cup p_3/R_{2,3}$
Construction

Create $A_1$, $A_2$, $A_3$, $S$, $C$; then

• $P_1$ has no relevant tickets
• $P_2$ has no relevant tickets
• $P_3$ has no relevant tickets
• $A_1$ has $P_1/Rtc$
• $A_2$ has $P_2/Rtc \cup A_1/tc$
• $A_3$ has $P_3/Rtc \cup A_2/tc$
• $S$ has $A_3/tc \cup C/Rtc$
• $C$ has $C/R_3t$
Construction

• Only $\text{link}_2(S, A_3)$ true $\Rightarrow$ apply $f_2$
  • $A_3$ has $P_3/Rtc \cup A_2/t \cup A_3/t \cup C/Rtc$

• Now $\text{link}_1(A_3, A_2)$ true $\Rightarrow$ apply $f_1$
  • $A_2$ has $P_2/Rtc \cup A_1/tc \cup A_2/t \cup C/Rtc$

• Now $\text{link}_1(A_2, A_1)$ true $\Rightarrow$ apply $f_1$
  • $A_1$ has $P_2/Rtc \cup A_1/t \cup C/Rtc$

• Now all $\text{link}_3$s true $\Rightarrow$ apply $f_3$
  • $C$ has $C/R_3 \cup P_1/R_{4,1} \cup P_2/R_{4,2} \cup P_3/R_{4,3}$
Finish Construction

• Now $link_4$ is true $\Rightarrow$ apply $f_4$
  • $P_1$ has $C/R_{1,1} \cup P_1/R_{2,1}$
  • $P_2$ has $C/R_{1,2} \cup P_2/R_{2,2}$
  • $P_3$ has $C/R_{1,3} \cup P_3/R_{2,3}$

• 3-parent joint create gives same rights to $P_1$, $P_2$, $P_3$, $C$
• If create of $C$ fails, $link_2$ fails, so construction fails
Theorem

• The two-parent joint creation operation can implement an $n$-parent joint creation operation with a fixed number of additional types and rights, and augmentations to the link predicates and filter functions.

• Proof: by construction, as above
  • Difference is that the two systems need not start at the same initial state
Theorems

• Monotonic ESPM and the monotonic HRU model are equivalent.
• Safety question in ESPM also decidable if acyclic attenuating scheme
  • Proof similar to that for SPM
Expressiveness

• Graph-based representation to compare models

• Graph
  • Vertex: represents entity, has static type
  • Edge: represents right, has static type

• Graph rewriting rules:
  • *Initial state operations* create graph in a particular state
  • *Node creation operations* add nodes, incoming edges
  • *Edge adding operations* add new edges between existing vertices
Example: 3-Parent Joint Creation

• Simulate with 2-parent
  • Nodes $P_1$, $P_2$, $P_3$ parents
  • Create node $C$ with type $c$ with edges of type $e$
  • Add node $A_1$ of type $a$ and edge from $P_1$ to $A_1$ of type $e'$
Next Step

- $A_1$, $P_2$ create $A_2$; $A_2$, $P_3$ create $A_3$
- Type of nodes, edges are $a$ and $e'$
Next Step

- $A_3$ creates $S$, of type $a$
- $S$ creates $C$, of type $c$
Last Step

• Edge adding operations:
  • $P_1 \rightarrow A_1 \rightarrow A_2 \rightarrow A_3 \rightarrow S \rightarrow C$: $P_1$ to $C$ edge type $e$
  • $P_2 \rightarrow A_2 \rightarrow A_3 \rightarrow S \rightarrow C$: $P_2$ to $C$ edge type $e$
  • $P_3 \rightarrow A_3 \rightarrow S \rightarrow C$: $P_3$ to $C$ edge type $e$
Definitions

• *Scheme*: graph representation as above
• *Model*: set of schemes
• Schemes $A, B$ correspond if graph for both is identical when all nodes with types not in $A$ and edges with types in $A$ are deleted
Example

• Above 2-parent joint creation simulation in scheme \textit{TWO}
• Equivalent to 3-parent joint creation scheme \textit{THREE} in which $P_1, P_2, P_3, C$ are of same type as in \textit{TWO}, and edges from $P_1, P_2, P_3$ to $C$ are of type $e$, and no types $a$ and $e'$ exist in \textit{TWO}
Simulation

Scheme $A$ simulates scheme $B$ iff

- every state $B$ can reach has a corresponding state in $A$ that $A$ can reach; and

- every state that $A$ can reach either corresponds to a state $B$ can reach, or has a successor state that corresponds to a state $B$ can reach
  - The last means that $A$ can have intermediate states not corresponding to states in $B$, like the intermediate ones in $TWO$ in the simulation of $THREE$
Expressive Power

• If there is a scheme in $MA$ that no scheme in $MB$ can simulate, $MB$ less expressive than $MA$

• If every scheme in $MA$ can be simulated by a scheme in $MB$, $MB$ as expressive as $MA$

• If $MA$ as expressive as $MB$ and vice versa, $MA$ and $MB$ equivalent
Example

• Scheme A in model \( M \)
  • Nodes \( X_1, X_2, X_3 \)
  • 2-parent joint create
  • 1 node type, 1 edge type
  • No edge adding operations
  • Initial state: \( X_1, X_2, X_3, \) no edges

• Scheme \( B \) in model \( N \)
  • All same as \( A \) except no 2-parent joint create
  • 1-parent create

• Which is more expressive?
Can A Simulate B?

• Scheme A simulates 1-parent create: have both parents be same node
  • Model M as expressive as model N
Can $B$ Simulate $A$?

• Suppose $X_1, X_2$ jointly create $Y$ in $A$
  • Edges from $X_1, X_2$ to $Y$, no edge from $X_3$ to $Y$
• Can $B$ simulate this?
  • Without loss of generality, $X_1$ creates $Y$
  • Must have edge adding operation to add edge from $X_2$ to $Y$
  • One type of node, one type of edge, so operation can add edge between any 2 nodes
No

- All nodes in $A$ have even number of incoming edges
  - 2-parent create adds 2 incoming edges
- Edge adding operation in $B$ that can edge from $X_2$ to $C$ can add one from $X_3$ to $C$
  - $A$ cannot enter this state
  - $B$ cannot transition to a state in which $Y$ has even number of incoming edges
    - No remove rule
- So $B$ cannot simulate $A$; $N$ less expressive than $M$
Theorem

• Monotonic single-parent models are less expressive than monotonic multiparent models

• Proof by contradiction
  • Scheme $A$ is multiparent model
  • Scheme $B$ is single parent create
  • Claim: $B$ can simulate $A$, without assumption that they start in the same initial state
    • Note: example assumed same initial state
Outline of Proof

• $X_1$, $X_2$ nodes in $A$
  • They create $Y_1$, $Y_2$, $Y_3$ using multiparent create rule
  • $Y_1$, $Y_2$ create $Z$, again using multiparent create rule
  • Note: no edge from $Y_3$ to $Z$ can be added, as $A$ has no edge-adding operation
Outline of Proof

- $W$, $X_1$, $X_2$ nodes in $B$
  - $W$ creates $Y_1$, $Y_2$, $Y_3$ using single parent create rule, and adds edges for $X_1$, $X_2$ to all using edge adding rule
  - $Y_1$ creates $Z$, again using single parent create rule; now must add edge from $Y_2$ to $Z$ to simulate $A$
  - Use same edge adding rule to add edge from $Y_3$ to $Z$: cannot duplicate this in scheme $A$!
Meaning

• Scheme $B$ cannot simulate scheme $A$, contradicting hypothesis

• ESPM more expressive than SPM
  • ESPM multiparent and monotonic
  • SPM monotonic but single parent